

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

~~~~~

IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION OPIATE LITIGATION  
CASE NO: 1:17-md-2804-DAP

~~~~~

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION
JANUARY 10, 2020 DISCOVERY CONFERENCE CALL

TRANSCRIBED JANUARY 20, 2020

Veritext Legal Solutions
1100 Superior Avenue, Suite 1820
Cleveland, Ohio

Shawna Hogan Cox, CA C.S.R. No. 14038

1 argument for the proposition that discovery is on hold
2 until something happens in the data track unless it has
3 to be the case.

4 For example, you know, maybe certain 30(b)(6)s
5 shouldn't happen until after certain things have
6 happened in the data track. I get that. But in the
7 meantime, all other discovery needs to go forward. All
8 other identification of custodians, all other, you know,
9 deposition scheduling, all of that needs to be going
10 forward. So that's the first point.

11 The second point is we need to address things
12 like the issue that Eric Delinsky raised, the threshold
13 issue of how -- how are we getting this -- you know, the
14 data has to start flowing, as the court said, first in
15 the two counties and then Ohio and et cetera, et cetera.
16 And that in -- that involves identification of fields
17 and so forth and so on.

18 I'm not quite certain where we are on that.
19 And I guess this is -- kind of comes under the rubric of
20 a plaintiff's issue. So we can kick this to Monday.
21 But I -- I do want to at least address the question of
22 identification and de-identification.

23 And David Ackerman, I got your e-mail. I -- I
24 think I frankly don't completely remember and still
25 don't completely remember 'cause I haven't had time to